

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO
WESTERN DIVISION**

BRENNAN LOVE BALL,
Plaintiff,

vs.

BARACK HUSSEIN OBAMA, et al.,
Defendants.

Case No. 1:13-cv-127

Weber, J.
Bowman, M.J.

**REPORT AND
RECOMMENDATION**

Plaintiff, a resident of Cincinnati, Ohio, brings this action against President Barak Obama and Brenda Denise Ball. By separate Order issued this date, plaintiff has been granted leave to proceed *in forma pauperis* pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915. This matter is before the Court for a sua sponte review of plaintiff's complaint to determine whether the complaint, or any portion of it, should be dismissed because it is frivolous, malicious, fails to state a claim upon which relief may be granted or seeks monetary relief from a defendant who is immune from such relief. 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B).

In enacting the original *in forma pauperis* statute, Congress recognized that a "litigant whose filing fees and court costs are assumed by the public, unlike a paying litigant, lacks an economic incentive to refrain from filing frivolous, malicious, or repetitive lawsuits." *Denton v. Hernandez*, 504 U.S. 25, 31 (1992) (quoting *Neitzke v. Williams*, 490 U.S. 319, 324 (1989)). To prevent such abusive litigation, Congress has authorized federal courts to dismiss an *in forma pauperis* complaint if they are satisfied that the action is frivolous or malicious. *Id.*; see also 28 U.S.C. §§ 1915(e)(2)(B)(i). A complaint may be dismissed as frivolous when the plaintiff cannot make any claim with a rational or arguable basis in fact or law. *Neitzke v. Williams*, 490 U.S. 319, 328-29 (1989); see also *Lawler v. Marshall*, 898 F.2d 1196, 1198 (6th Cir. 1990). An action has no arguable legal basis when the defendant is immune from suit or when plaintiff claims a

violation of a legal interest which clearly does not exist. *Neitzke*, 490 U.S. at 327. An action has no arguable factual basis when the allegations are delusional or rise to the level of the irrational or “wholly incredible.” *Denton*, 504 U.S. at 32; *Lawler*, 898 F.2d at 1199. The Court need not accept as true factual allegations that are “fantastic or delusional” in reviewing a complaint for frivolousness. *Hill v. Lappin*, 630 F.3d 468, 471 (6th Cir. 2010) (quoting *Neitzke*, 490 U.S. at 328).

Congress also has authorized the *sua sponte* dismissal of complaints that fail to state a claim upon which relief may be granted. 28 U.S.C. §§ 1915 (e)(2)(B)(ii). A complaint filed by a *pro se* plaintiff must be “liberally construed” and “held to less stringent standards than formal pleadings drafted by lawyers.” *Erickson v. Pardus*, 551 U.S. 89, 94 (2007) (per curiam) (quoting *Estelle v. Gamble*, 429 U.S. 97, 106 (1976)). By the same token, however, the complaint “must contain sufficient factual matter, accepted as true, to ‘state a claim to relief that is plausible on its face.’” *Ashcroft v. Iqbal*, 556 U.S. 662, 678 (2009) (quoting *Bell Atlantic Corp. v. Twombly*, 550 U.S. 544, 570 (2007)); *see also Hill*, 630 F.3d at 470-71 (“dismissal standard articulated in *Iqbal* and *Twombly* governs dismissals for failure to state a claim” under §§ 1915A(b)(1) and 1915(e)(2)(B)(ii)).

“A claim has facial plausibility when the plaintiff pleads factual content that allows the court to draw the reasonable inference that the defendant is liable for the misconduct alleged.” *Iqbal*, 556 U.S. at 678 (citing *Twombly*, 550 U.S. at 556). The Court must accept all well-pleaded factual allegations as true, but need not “accept as true a legal conclusion couched as a factual allegation.” *Twombly*, 550 U.S. at 555 (quoting *Papasan v. Allain*, 478 U.S. 265, 286 (1986)). Although a complaint need not contain “detailed factual allegations,” it must provide “more than an unadorned, the-defendant-unlawfully-harmed-me accusation.” *Iqbal*, 556 U.S. at 678 (citing

Twombly, 550 U.S. at 555). A pleading that offers “labels and conclusions” or “a formulaic recitation of the elements of a cause of action will not do.” *Twombly*, 550 U.S. at 555. Nor does a complaint suffice if it tenders “naked assertion[s]” devoid of “further factual enhancement.” *Id.* at 557. The complaint must “give the defendant fair notice of what the . . . claim is and the grounds upon which it rests.” *Erickson*, 551 U.S. at 93 (citations omitted).

Plaintiff’s complaint includes the following allegations:

I have an agreement with my biological father President Barack Obama that he would provide relief for educational and living expenses totaling 450,000 U.S.D. I have student loans in both undergraduate and graduate for all of 50,000 U.S.D.

I have been threatened by Pollworkers then reprimanded about voting against the 2008 Democratic Presidential Party on November 4, 2008. This took place in Hyde Park Cincinnati, Ohio.

President Barack Hussein Obama is my biological father with unpaid obligations.

Half of my time studying at the University of Cincinnati was being told to switch majors totaling to a loss of income totaling 3.8 million U.S.D. overtime. I managed to obtain a degree in Social Work vs. Biology. Now I have debt piling. Each time I prepared for the ACT I was told to fail. Yearly, for the past four years I have heard from him via news broadcasting.

I have reason to believe there has been an abuse of orders given from President Barack Obama on how to handle the relief of debt. I am requesting an additional 16 million U.S.D.

Myself and family members have been physically and psychological abuse (sic). Scared; Threatened with murder.

(Doc. 1, p. 3). For relief, plaintiff makes the following requests:

Help me to find the correct path to a resolution in which both parties can and will be respected of the outcome. I understand making the claim that President Barack Hussein Obama is my biological father is acute however, it is indeed true. My safety and monetary outlook are very dim.

I have been under the scrutiny of people and forces that threat, bring harm, and annoy my everyday life. If someone could explain what I should do with this information, I would be thankful. Not only have I been told what to do, how to

live, up until the age of 27, it has also come to my attention that President Barack Obama has not made attempts to answer my questions or request.

Id. at 4.

In this case, plaintiff contends that the Court has subject matter jurisdiction over his case pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1332(a)(1). (Doc. 1, p. 2). However, plaintiff fails to assert any claim with an arguable basis in law over which this Court has subject matter jurisdiction on the basis of diversity of citizenship. With regard to diversity jurisdiction, a district court has jurisdiction over a suit between citizens of different states when the amount in controversy “exceeds the sum or value of \$75,000, exclusive of interest and costs.” 28 U.S.C. § 1332(a). For a federal court to have diversity jurisdiction pursuant to section 1332(a), the citizenship of the plaintiff must be “diverse from the citizenship of each defendant” thereby ensuring “complete diversity.” *Caterpillar Inc. v. Lewis*, 519 U.S. 61, 68 (1996) (citing *State Farm Fire & Casualty Co. v. Tashire*, 386 U.S. 523, 531 (1967)). In other words, for complete diversity to exist the plaintiff must be a citizen of a different state than each of the defendants. *Caterpillar*, 519 U.S. at 68; *Napleton v. Hillsdale College*, 385 F.2d 871, 872 (6th Cir. 1967). In the absence of complete diversity, the Court lacks subject matter jurisdiction. *Caterpillar*, 519 U.S. at 68.

There is not complete diversity of citizenship in this case. The complaint indicates that plaintiff and defendant Brenda Denise Ball are both Ohio citizens. (Complaint, pp. 1-2). Accordingly, this Court lacks subject matter jurisdiction on the basis of diversity of citizenship.

To the extent that plaintiff seeks to invoke the Court’s federal question jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1331, the complaint must still be dismissed. The complaint provides no factual content or context from which the Court may reasonably infer that the defendants violated plaintiff’s rights. The complaint does not contain a single allegation regarding defendant Ball and

plaintiff's factual allegations regarding defendant President Obama rise to the level of the delusional, irrational and "wholly incredible." Furthermore, to the extent that plaintiff is seeking a determination of paternity and/or support such issues are matters to be handled in state court. Accordingly, the complaint should be dismissed under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B).

IT IS THEREFORE RECOMMENDED THAT:

1. Plaintiff's complaint be dismissed be dismissed under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B).
2. The Court certify pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a) that for the foregoing reasons an appeal of any Order adopting this Report and Recommendation would not be taken in good faith and therefore deny plaintiff leave to appeal *in forma pauperis*. Plaintiff remains free to apply to proceed *in forma pauperis* in the Court of Appeals. See *Callihan v. Schneider*, 178 F.3d 800, 803 (6th Cir. 1999), overruling in part *Floyd v. United States Postal Serv.*, 105 F.3d 274, 277 (6th Cir. 1997).

s/ Stephanie K. Bowman
Stephanie K. Bowman
United States Magistrate Judge

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO
WESTERN DIVISION**

BRENNAN LOVE BALL,
Plaintiff,

vs.

BARACK HUSSEIN OBAMA, et al.,
Defendants.

Case No. 1:13-cv-127

Weber, J.
Bowman, M.J.

NOTICE

Pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b), **WITHIN 14 DAYS** after being served with a copy of the recommended disposition, a party may serve and file specific written objections to the proposed findings and recommendations. This period may be extended further by the Court on timely motion for an extension. Such objections shall specify the portions of the Report objected to and shall be accompanied by a memorandum of law in support of the objections. If the Report and Recommendation is based in whole or in part upon matters occurring on the record at an oral hearing, the objecting party shall promptly arrange for the transcription of the record, or such portions of it as all parties may agree upon, or the Magistrate Judge deems sufficient, unless the assigned District Judge otherwise directs. A party may respond to another party's objections **WITHIN 14 DAYS** after being served with a copy thereof. Failure to make objections in accordance with this procedure may forfeit rights on appeal. *See Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140 (1985); *United States v. Walters*, 638 F.2d 947 (6th Cir. 1981).